

Biblical Discernment in a Time of Racial Divide Pt.2

The Evil of Racism

Stephen Jay Gould wrote, in 1977

“Biological arguments for racism may have been common before 1859, but they increased by orders of magnitude following the acceptance of evolutionary theory.”

—Stephen Jay Gould, a leading evolutionist (*Ontogeny and Phylogeny*, 1977)

Recent History is replete with examples barbarism and the slaughter of millions of humans beings due to the adoption and implementation the theory of Evolution.

This godless evil has been a plague on the world ever since the publication of “On the Origin of Species” by Charles Darwin on Nov 24, 1859

World leaders have use this heresy for there socio-political and economic agendas at the expense of human life.

Racism, fueled by Evolutionary Theory (Darwinianism) has produced hate filled populations of people bent on the destruction of other people simply because they are a different shade of brown.

To see how evil this can be, let me take you back September 9, 1906

The New York Times headline read, “Bushman shares a cage with Bronx Park apes.”

This was in reference to Ota, a small black man that had been taken from the Continent of Africa

He was first brought to the United States from the Belgian Congo in 1904 by the noted African explorer Samuel Verner, who had bought him at a slave auction. At 4’11” tall, weighing a mere 103 pounds, he was often referred to as “the boy.” In reality, he was a son, a husband, and a father.

Ota was first displayed as an “emblematic savage” in the anthropology wing of the 1904 St. Louis World’s Fair. Along with other pygmies, he was studied by scientists to learn how the “barbaric races” compared with intellectually defective Caucasians on intelligence tests and how they responded to things such as pain.¹

When Verner presented Ota to Dr. Hornady, the director of the Bronx Zoological Gardens, it was clear that he would again go on display—but this time, the display took on an even more sinister twist. Although Dr. Hornady insisted that he was merely offering an “intriguing exhibit” for the public, the *Times* reported that Dr. Hornady “apparently saw no difference between a wild beast and the little black man; and for the first time in any American zoo, a human being was being displayed in a cage.”

Ota crouched in the corner of the cage. With his head between his knees and his arms pulling his legs tightly to his chest, he shielded himself as best he could from the crowd.

The iron bars around him offered a certain level of physical protection from the mob that swirled around him—but they did nothing to protect him from the stares, from the laughter, from the jeers that rained down upon him day after day after day. Coins and stones pelted his flesh, the crowd hoping to instigate some sort of reaction. His infrequent backlashes of anger only incited them further.

Bradford and Blume, who extensively researched Ota's life for the book *Ota Benga: The Pygmy in the Zoo*, noted:

The implications of the exhibit were also clear from the visitor's questions. Was he a man or a monkey? Was he something in between? Was it a forgotten stage of evolution?

On September 10, the *Times* reported:

There was always a crowd before the cage, most of the time roaring with laughter, and from almost every corner of the garden could be heard the question "Where is the pygmy?" The answer was, "In the monkey house."

Dr. Hornady was a staunch believer in Darwin's theory. *The New York Times* on September 11, 1906, reported that he had concluded that there was "a close analogy of the African savage to the apes" and that he "maintained a hierarchical view of the races. . . ." The display was extremely successful. On September 16, 40,000 visitors came to the zoo. The crowds were so enormous that a police officer was assigned to guard Ota full time because he was "always in danger of being grabbed, yanked, poked, and pulled to pieces by the mob."⁵

Not all condoned the frenzy. A group of concerned black ministers went to Ota's defense. The September 10 *Times* reported Reverend Gordon saying, "Our race . . . is depressed enough without exhibiting one of us with the apes." On September 12, however, the *Times* retorted by saying, "The reverend colored brother should be told that evolution . . . is now taught in the textbooks of all the schools, and that it is no more debatable than the multiplication table."

The media frenzy eventually led to Ota being released from the cage, but the spectacle continued. The *Times* reported on September 18, "There were 40,000 visitors to the park on Sunday. Nearly every man, woman, and child of this crowd made for the monkey house to see the star attraction in the park—a wild man from Africa. They chased him

about the grounds all day, howling, cheering, and yelling. Some of them poked him in the ribs, others tripped him up, all laughed at him.”

Eventually, Hornady himself was worn down (either by the media pressure or by the exhaustion that the spectacle had created). Ota was released from the zoo. In the following months, he found care at a succession of institutions and with several sympathetic individuals. In 1910, he arrived at a black community in Lynchburg, Virginia, where he found companionship and care. He became a baptized Christian, and his English vocabulary rapidly improved. He regularly cared for the children, protecting them and teaching them to hunt. He also learned how to read and occasionally attended classes at a Lynchburg seminary. Later he was employed as a tobacco factory worker.

But Ota grew increasingly depressed, hostile, irrational, and forlorn. When people spoke to him, they noticed that he had tears in his eyes when he told them he wanted to go home. Concluding that he would never be able to return to his native land, on March 20, 1916, Ota pressed a revolver to his chest and sent a bullet through his heart.

<https://answersingenesis.org/answers/books/one-race-one-blood/>

The theory of Darwinian evolution claims that human beings changed “from-molecules-to-man” over millions and millions of years, with one of our intermediate states being that of the apes.

This theory logically implies that certain “races” are more ape-like than they might be human. Ever since the theory of evolution became popular and widespread, Darwinian scientists have been attempting to form continuums that represent the evolution of humanity, with some “races” being placed closer to the apes, while others are placed higher on the evolutionary scale. These continuums are formed solely by outward appearances and are still used today to justify racism—even though modern genetics has clearly proven that our differences, few as they might be, (are only skin deep)

On the last page of his book, *The Descent of Man*, Charles Darwin expressed the opinion that he would rather be descended from a monkey than from a “Savage.” In describing those with darker skin, he often used words like “savage,” “low,” and “degraded” to describe American Indians, pygmies, and almost every ethnic group whose physical appearance and culture differed from his own. In his work, pygmies have been compared to “lower organisms” and were labeled “the low integrated inhabitants of the Andaman Islands.”⁶

Although racism did not begin with Darwinism, Darwin did more than any person to popularize it. After Darwin “proved” that all humans descended from apes, it was natural to conclude that some races had descended further than others. In his opinion, some races (namely the white ones) have left the others far behind, while other races (pygmies especially) have hardly matured at all. The subtitle of Darwin’s classic 1859 book,

The Origin of the Species, was *The Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life*. T

The book dealt with the evolution of animals in general, and his later book, *The Descent of Man*, applied his theory to humans.

<https://answersingenesis.org/answers/books/one-race-one-blood/>

The widely held view was that blacks evolved from the strong but less intelligent gorillas, the Orientals evolved from the orangutan, and whites evolved from the most intelligent of all primates, the chimpanzees.⁸ Across the globe, such conclusions were used to justify racism, oppression, and genocide.

Within decades, however, evolution would be used as justification for the whites of Europe to turn upon themselves.

Perhaps the most infamous abuse of evolution to justify racism was Adolf Hitler's Nazi regime, which promoted a master race and sought to exterminate so-called inferior races.

Historian Arthur Keith described this particularly insidious harvest from Darwin's garden with these words in the book *Evolution and Ethics*:

"To see evolutionary measures and tribal morality being applied rigorously to the affairs of a great modern nation, we must turn again to Germany of 1942. We see Hitler devoutly convinced that evolution provides the only real basis for a national policy. . . . The German Fuhrer, as I have consistently maintained, is an evolutionist; he has consciously sought to make the practice of Germany conform to the theory of evolution."¹²

<https://answersingenesis.org/answers/books/one-race-one-blood/>

Jim Fletcher recalls (his own) vivid impressions from visiting the Holocaust Museum in Washington, D.C.:

The railroad car, once you realize what it represents, forces you in, although not in the same way that people it memorializes were forced aboard so many decades ago. The odd smell—which many visitors say must be the smell of death—can't be scrubbed away. It shouldn't be, for it reminds our senses in a visceral way of what happens when men leave God, and (evil) ideas go unchallenged. . . . When Adolph Hitler looked for a "final solution" for what he called the "Jewish problem"—the fact of the Jews' existence—he had only to recall what scientists and liberal theologians embraced:

that a purposeless process, known as evolution, had generated all of life's complexity, including civilization itself. It had done so through a pitiless procedure of the strong eliminating the weak.

Continued racism on European soil has resulted in bitter struggles and untold bloodshed between those of different "races" who occupy the same lands.

<https://answersingenesis.org/answers/books/one-race-one-blood/>

Stalin, Hitler, and Mao were responsible for the deaths of tens of millions—and it can be shown that they did this because of the influence of Darwinian naturalism, which fanned the flames of ethnic superiority.

According to human reason, everyone decides what is right in his own eyes.

Once people abandon the authority of God's Word, there is no foundation for morality and justice in the world. When God's truth is rejected, human reason alone is used to justify evil of every sort.

- Racism
- Euthanasia
- Abortion

The effect of Darwinism on racism, however, is certainly not limited to Europe. The fruit of Darwin's garden was (and is) being reaped (in other lands as well like) Australia, which was involved in a gruesome trade in "missing link" specimens fueled by early evolutionary and racist ideas.

Documented evidence shows that the remains of perhaps 10,000 or more of Australia's Aborigines were shipped to British museums in a frenzied attempt to prove the widespread belief that they were the "missing link."

Evolutionists in the United States were also strongly involved in this flourishing industry of gathering species of "sub-humans." (The Smithsonian Institution in Washington holds the remains of over 15,000 individuals!)

Some museums were not only interested in bones but also in fresh skins. These were sometimes used to provide interesting evolutionary displays when they were stuffed.¹⁰ Good prices were being offered for such "specimens." Written evidence shows that many of the "fresh" specimens were obtained by simply going out and murdering the aboriginal people....

An 1866 deathbed memoir from Korah Wills, mayor of Bowen, in Queensland, Australia, graphically describes how he killed and dismembered local tribesmen in 1865 to provide a scientific specimen.

<https://answersingenesis.org/answers/books/one-race-one-blood/>

The seeds from Darwin's garden even spread as far as Asia, where evolutionary thinking was used to justify their acts of racism and genocide. In order to justify their nation's expansionist aggression, the Japanese had been told that they were the most "highly evolved" race on earth. After all, the Europeans, with their longer arms and hairy chests, were clearly closer to the ape, weren't they? Westerners returned in kind, of course, often portraying the Japanese as uncivilized savages in order to dehumanize their killing with weapons of mass destruction.

In North America, Darwinism was used to justify colonial slavery as well as the elimination of "savage native tribes" who hindered the European's westward expansion....People on various continents wanted to "prove" that their "race" originated

first. As a result, the Germans trumpeted Neanderthal fossils, the British did the same with Piltdown Man, and so on. Currently, members of the Ku Klux Klan justify their racism on the basis that they are a more evolutionary advanced race.

By the way

The February 14, 2019 edition of the Linden, Alabama weekly newspaper *The Democrat-Reporter* carried an editorial titled "Klan needs to ride again"

The current Christian Identity Movement believes that Jews and blacks are not really human at all.

Today, Darwinism and evolutionary thinking also enable ordinary, respectable professionals—otherwise dedicated to the saving of life—to justify their involvement in the slaughter of millions of unborn human beings, who (like the Aborigines of earlier Darwinian thinking) are also deemed “not yet fully human.”

<https://answersingenesis.org/answers/books/one-race-one-blood/>

In America slaveholders argued that the principle of slavery was justified for three basic reasons:

1. The Africans are a distinct race of people, they cannot mix with whites and must exist as a separate class.
2. The Africans are, as a class, inferior to the whites in intellectual and moral development, they are incompetent to self-government.
3. The Israelites subdued heathen people groups; it is appropriate to make domestic slaves of inferior people.

The debate within the Christian community over slavery led to splits within major denominations. Many of the splits left the more fundamental/evangelical groups supporting race-based slavery, while more liberal groups were abolitionists.¹ For example, the issue of slavery divided the Baptists into two groups in 1845—the Southern Baptists (who were pro-slavery) and the American Baptists (who were abolitionists).²

Race-based slavery led to fractured relationships between “blacks” and “whites” within church and denominations as well. This tension reached a peak one Sunday when African Americans were forbidden to pray in the presence of Caucasians. This event led to the founding of the historic Bethel African Methodist Episcopal Church. The history of the church states:

When officials at St. George’s MEC [Methodist Episcopal Church] pulled blacks off their knees while praying, FAS [Free African Society] members discovered just how far American Methodists would go to enforce racial discrimination against African Americans. Hence, these members of St. George’s made plans to transform their mutual aid society into an African congregation. Although most wanted to affiliate with the Protestant Episcopal Church, Allen led a small group who resolved to remain Methodists. In 1794, Bethel AME [African Methodist Episcopal] was dedicated with Allen as pastor. To establish Bethel’s independence from interfering white Methodists, Allen, a former Delaware slave, successfully sued in the Pennsylvania courts in 1807 and 1815 for the right of his congregation to exist as an independent institution.

Because black Methodists in other middle Atlantic communities encountered racism and desired religious autonomy, Allen called them to meet in Philadelphia to form a new Wesleyan denomination, the A.M.E.³

In the midst of this dark period in our history, we must not forget the sparks of light that brightened the darkened sky like shooting stars. A monumental shift in governmental policy took place on January 1, 1863. When Abraham Lincoln signed the Emancipation Proclamation, it was a landmark that altered the course of racism in the United States. Due to a multiracial effort, slavery had been made illegal. This legal victory came at the cost of staining U.S. soil with the blood of its own sons and daughters and set the country in a new direction.

<https://answersingenesis.org/answers/books/one-race-one-blood/>

In honesty, however, the legal abolishment of slavery did little to unify the church across racial/ethnic lines.

It is very interesting to note that during this same season of history, Darwinian theories were beginning to make their way to American shores. Without the legal ability to enforce slavery, many people turned to the theories of Darwin to justify racism in its many forms.

They began to use [evolution](#) as justification of their views that African Americans were an inferior “race” and a “sub-species” that was not really fully human and not deserving of fair and equal treatment. “Jim Crow laws,” for example, were often fueled by evolutionary ideas:

The fundamental/evangelical church was foundering in this sea of racism, and some of these struggles continue today. For example, a number of both Old Testament and New Testament Scriptures have been used to say that God forbids interracial marriage.

<https://answersingenesis.org/answers/books/one-race-one-blood/>

Due to beliefs that interracial marriage was at worst sin, and at best unwise, many fundamental/evangelical leaders supported segregated communities and segregated churches.

In 1956, evangelist John R. Rice expressed the following thoughts:

But I say frankly that many things are worse than these, and most intelligent people would prefer to have Jim Crow laws than to have unrestrained intermarriage between the races.

<https://answersingenesis.org/answers/books/one-race-one-blood/>

Socially, it is better for both Negroes and whites to run with their own kind and intermarry with their own kind. The mixing of races widely differing is almost never wise. . . . Thus if a girl would do wrong to marry a Negro boy, she would be wrong to keep company with him, mixing regularly with him in a social life.⁷

In 1961, M.R. Dehaan expressed his view about interracial marriage with these words:

I feel Negroes and Whites should never intermarry, but where possible live in their own social and religious groups and churches. . . . as far as the intimate relationship and fellowship which comes by living in the same sections in a community, I do not believe that the time is ripe.⁸

<https://answersingenesis.org/answers/books/one-race-one-blood/>

It should be acknowledged that Rice and DeHaan were seeking to deal with cultural realities of their day. Both expressed concern about oppression of African Americans, but they also supported, at least for their time, the segregation of the so-called human “races.”

During this time, African Americans were subjected to great injustices in the land of the free. From Jim Crow laws to scientific experimentation, African Americans were denied many of their basic rights as United States citizens and given little of the respect they deserved as human beings.

This caused a growing mistrust between African Americans and the mainstream fundamental/evangelical Christians. While the African Americans suffered and struggled, the Church was largely silent and indifferent to their plight. The reaction of African Americans to the outright racism and silence was predictable. As the Bible says: *A brother offended is harder to be won than a strong city, and contentions are like the bars of a citadel (Proverbs 18:19).*

<https://answersingenesis.org/answers/books/one-race-one-blood/>

But the church and the Pastors of the churches should be speaking out on the topic of Racism and what does the Bible say about it and how do we solve the Racism issue. But not with the bankrupt and corrupt humanistic and marxist philosophy of social justice and critical race theory that is being promoted by the political Pundits and professors of major universities and Seminaries, Rather we need to be heralding the sufficiency of the Gospel and Scripture by the power of the Holy Spirit to change the heart of man.

Lesson

The Definition of Racism

The Secular World view

The Biblical World view

The Evil of Racism

1. Its Murder
2. Its Prideful
3. Its Prejudicial
3. Its Blasphemy

The Definition of Racism

The Secular World view

Racism appears to be a word of recent origin, with no citations currently known that would suggest the word was in use prior to the early 20th century.

<https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/racism>

the belief that different races possess distinct characteristics, abilities, or qualities, especially so as to distinguish them as inferior or superior to one another.

Racism is the belief that a particular race is superior or inferior to another, that a person's social and moral traits are predetermined by his or her inborn biological characteristics.

increasingly evolutionary evidence suggests that the dispersal of one original people into different geographical locations is a relatively recent and genetically insignificant matter.

<https://www.oxfordreference.com/view/10.1093/oi/authority.20111012125231893>

The Biblical World view

James 2:1–13 (NKJV)

¹My brethren, do not hold the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Lord of glory, with partiality.

²For if there should come into your assembly a man with gold rings, in fine apparel, and there should also come in a poor man in filthy clothes,

³and you pay attention to the one wearing the fine clothes and say to him, "You sit here in a good place," and say to the poor man, "You stand there," or, "Sit here at my footstool,"

⁴have you not shown partiality among yourselves, and become judges with evil thoughts?

¹My brethren, do not hold (Pres. Imperative) the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Lord of glory, **with partiality.**

prosópolémpsia: respect of persons

Original Word: προσωποληψία, ας, ἡ

Part of Speech: Noun, Feminine

Transliteration: prosópolémpsia

Phonetic Spelling: (pros-o-pol-ape-see'-ah)

Definition: respect of persons

Usage: partiality, favoritism.

origin of word

prosópon: the face

Original Word: πρόσωπον, ου, τό

Part of Speech: Noun, Neuter

Transliteration: prosópon

Phonetic Spelling: (pros'-o-pon)

Definition: the face

Usage: the face, countenance, surface.

lambanó: to take, receive

Original Word: λαμβάνω

Part of Speech: Verb

Transliteration: lambanó

Phonetic Spelling: (lam-ban'-o)

Definition: to take, receive

Usage: (a) I receive, get, (b) I take, lay hold of.

Romans 2:11 (NKJV)

¹¹For there is no partiality with God.

1 Peter 1:17 (NKJV)

¹⁷And if you call on the Father, who without partiality judges according to each one's work, conduct yourselves throughout the time of your stay here in fear;

Job 34:19 (NKJV)

¹⁹Yet He is not partial to princes, Nor does He regard the rich more than the poor; For they are all the work of His hands.

partiality n. — an inclination to favor one group or view or opinion over alternatives; especially considered as an injustice.

⁴have you not shown partiality
among yourselves, and become
evil thoughts?

judges with

shown partiality

diakrinó: to distinguish, to judge

Original Word: διακρίνω

Part of Speech: Verb

Transliteration: diakrinó

Phonetic Spelling: (dee-ak-ree'-no)

Definition: to distinguish, to judge

Usage: I separate, distinguish, discern one thing from another; I doubt, hesitate, waver. 1252 diakrínō (from 1223 /diá, "thoroughly back-and-forth," which intensifies 2919 /krínō, "to judge") – properly, investigate (judge) thoroughly – literally, judging "back-and-forth" which can either (positively) refer to close-reasoning (discrimination) or negatively "over-judging" (going too far, vacillating). Only the context indicates which sense is meant.

evil thoughts?

ponéros: toilsome, bad

Original Word: πονηρός, ἄ, ὄν

Part of Speech: Adjective

Transliteration: ponéros

Phonetic Spelling: (pon-ay-ros')

Definition: toilsome, bad

Usage: evil, bad, wicked, malicious, slothful.

4190 ponēros (an adjective which is also used substantively, derived from 4192 /pónos, "pain, laborious trouble") – properly, pain-ridden, emphasizing the inevitable agonies (misery) that always go with evil.

thoughts?

dialogismos: a reasoning

Original Word: διαλογισμός, οὔ, ὁ

Part of Speech: Noun, Masculine

Transliteration: dialogismos

Phonetic Spelling: (dee-al-og-is-mos')

Definition: a reasoning

Usage: a calculation, reasoning, thought, movement of thought, deliberation, plotting.

Cognate: 1261 dialogismós (from 1260 /dialogízomai, "back-and-forth reasoning") – reasoning that is self-based and therefore confused – especially as it contributes to reinforcing others in discussion to remain in their initial prejudice. [See 1260](#) (dialogizomai).

This is the root of Racism.

EVIL Thoughts

This leads to the second point

2.The Evil of Racism

Racism is a stain on American history that has left shame, injustice, and horrible violence in its wake. The institution of slavery and a costly civil war left a deep racial divide and bred bitter resentment on every side. No sensible person would suggest that all the vestiges of those evils were totally erased by the civil rights movement of the

mid-twentieth century. Civil rights legislation now guards the legal principle of equal rights for all Americans, but no law can change the heart of someone who is filled with prejudice or bitterness.

Matthew 15:17–20 (NKJV)

¹⁷Do you not yet understand that whatever enters the mouth goes into the stomach and is eliminated?

¹⁸But those things which proceed out of the mouth come from the heart, and they defile a man.

¹⁹For out of the heart proceed evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, blasphemies.

²⁰These are the things which defile a man, but to eat with unwashed hands does not defile a man.”

1. Its Murder
2. Its Prideful
3. Its Prejudicial
4. Its Blasphemy

1. Its Murder

1 John 3:15 (NKJV)

¹⁵ Whoever hates his brother is a murderer, and you know that no murderer has eternal life abiding in him.

3588 [e]

ho

ó

-

A r t -

NMS

3404 [e]

misōn

μισῶν

hating

V-PPA-NMS

The root of all murder is hate that expresses itself in anger. Murder is the first physical crime committed in Creation. Its father is the devil and the soil is the sinful heart of man.

Racism is a stain on American history that has left shame, injustice, and horrible violence in its wake. The institution of slavery and a costly civil war left a deep racial divide and bred bitter resentment on every side. No sensible person would suggest that all the vestiges of those evils were totally erased by the civil rights movement of the mid-twentieth century. Civil rights legislation now guards the legal principle of equal rights for all Americans, but no law can change the heart of someone who is filled with prejudice or bitterness.

1 John 4:7–8 (NKJV)

⁷Beloved, let us love one another, for love is of God; and everyone who loves is born of God and knows God.

⁸He who does not love does not know God, for God is love.

1 John 4:10–11 (NKJV)

¹⁰In this is love, not that we loved God, but that He loved us and sent His Son to be the propitiation for our sins.

¹¹Beloved, if God so loved us, we also ought to love one another.

1 John 4:20 (NKJV)

²⁰If someone says, "I love God," and hates his brother, he is a liar; for he who does not love his brother whom he has seen, how can he love God whom he has not seen?

John 8:44 (NKJV)

⁴⁴You are of your father the devil, and the desires of your father you want to do. He was a murderer from the beginning, and does not stand in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaks a lie, he speaks from his own resources, for he is a liar and the father of it

Matthew 5:21–22 (NKJV)

²¹"You have heard that it was said to those of old, 'You shall not murder, and whoever murders will be in danger of the judgment.'

²²But I say to you that whoever is angry with his brother without a cause shall be in danger of the judgment. And whoever says to his brother, 'Raca!' shall be in danger of the council. But whoever says, 'You fool!' shall be in danger of hell fire.

²²But I say to you that whoever is **angry** with his brother without a _____ cause shall be in danger of the _____ judgment.

angryorgizomenos

ὀργιζόμενος

being angry with

V-PPM/P-NMS

orgízō – be angry, as expressing a "fixed anger" (settled opposition). 3710 /orgízō ("to show settled-opposition") is positive when inspired by God – and always negative when arising from the flesh. "Sinful (unnecessary) anger" focuses on punishing the offender rather than the moral content of the offense. (orgē).

orgé (from orgáō, "to teem, swelling up to constitutionally oppose") – properly, settled anger (opposition), i.e. rising up from an ongoing (fixed) opposition.

3709 /orgé ("settled anger") proceeds from an internal disposition which steadfastly opposes someone or something based on extended personal exposure, i.e. solidifying what the beholder considers wrong (unjust, evil).

["Orgē comes from the verb oragō meaning, 'to teem, to swell'; and thus implies that it is not a sudden outburst, but rather (referring to God's) fixed, controlled, passionate feeling against sin . . . a settled indignation (so Hendriksen)" (D. E. Hiebert, at 1 Thes 1:10).]

²²But I say to you that whoever is angry
with his brother without a cause shall be in danger of the judgment.
And whoever _____ says to his brother, '**Raca!**' shall be in
_____ danger of the council

'Raca!'

_rhaká (apparently related to the Aramaic term rōq, "empty") – properly, empty-headed. This term expressed contempt for a man's head, viewing him as stupid (without sense) – i.e. a "numbskull" who acts presumptuously and thoughtlessly (TDNT).

What is the significance of the epithet 'raka'?

It was abusive speech [BECNT], expressing contempt [ICC, My, NIBC, NICNT, NTC, PNTC]. It was an objectionable insult, but would have been taken more seriously than in our own contemporary culture [WBC]. 'Raka' was almost a swear-word in Aramaic [NAC]. It was someone with an empty mind [Lns]. It was a commonly used term of contempt [My].

Abernathy, D. (2013). [An Exegetical Summary of Matthew 1–16](#) (p. 133). Dallas, TX: SIL International.

The precise meaning of this word is uncertain, but it is clearly an expression of contempt that evidently was used by angry people

This form of anger, Jesus says, renders a person *subject to the Sanhedrin* (which would support the view that *the judgment* in the earlier part of the verse means that of the law court). Sanhedrin means “council” (e.g., 10:17), but it is used mostly in the New Testament for the high council of the Jews. It comprised priests, elders, and scribes, and the high priest was its president
 Jesus is saying that the insolent and insulting person is not guiltless: he must give account of himself

It is usually held to be derived from the Aramaic רַקָּא, “a shortened form of רַקָּז, ‘empty,’ as vocalized in the Galilaean dialect” (AS). But BAGD notes its use “as an uncomplimentary, perh. foul epithet in a Zenon pap. of 257 B.C.” when it is unlikely to be Aramaic. It also finds it in the Talmud. It notes that Jerome and others take it as equivalent to χενός, “empty-head, numbskull, fool.” Compare Chrysostom, who said, “this word ‘Raca,’ is not an expression of great insolence, but rather of some contempt and slight on the part of the speaker.” It is like talking to servants or “any very inferior person” (p. 110).

Morris, L. (1992). [*The Gospel according to Matthew*](#). Grand Rapids, MI; Leicester, England: W.B. Eerdmans; Inter-Varsity Press.

²²But I say to you that whoever is angry
 with his brother without a cause shall be in
 danger of the judgment. And whoever says to his
 brother, ‘Raca!’ shall be in danger of the council.
But whoever says, ‘**You fool!**’ shall be in danger of hell fire.

‘You fool!’

móros: dull, stupid, foolish

Original Word: μωρός, ἄ, ὄν

Part of Speech: Adjective

Transliteration: móros

Phonetic Spelling: (mo-ros')

Definition: dull, stupid, foolish

Usage: (a) adj: stupid, foolish, (b) noun: a fool.

3474 mōrós (the root of the English terms, "moron, moronic") – properly, dull (insipid), flat ("without an edge"); (figuratively) "mentally inert"; dull in understanding; nonsensical ("moronic"), lacking a grip on reality (acting as though "brainless").

[This root (mōr-) "properly refers to physical nerves causing one to become dull, sluggish (so Hipp., Aristotle); used of the mind, dull, stupid, foolish" (Abbott-Smith); "flat/insipid" (WS, 1062). 3474 (mōrós) is used ironically of apparent stupidity in 1 Cor 1;25,27, 3:18.]

The person who is angry enough to utter this derogatory word “is guilty enough to go into the hell of fire” (BAGD).⁹²

Morris, L. (1992). *The Gospel according to Matthew* (p. 115). Grand Rapids, MI; Leicester, England: W.B. Eerdmans; Inter-Varsity Press.

There is a noticeable ascendancy of the level of accountability (court, High Court, God) but the level of sin doesn't seem to parallel.

But if you consider the on going nature of the Anger, the settled anger that is continuous (pres. participle)

It would seem that the Lord is saying that the longer the anger remains the more severe the response of judgment.

Level one anger is dealt with in low courts

if not

Level 2 anger produces insults and is dealt with in High Court.

if not

Level 3 Anger remains and produces a settled mindset of animosity (fool) it is dealt with in Hell.

It should be noted that unrepentant murderers, or those who harbor hate and anger in their hearts will never see heaven.

Revelation 21:7–8 (NKJV)

⁷He who overcomes shall inherit all things, and I will be his God and he shall be My son.

⁸But the cowardly, unbelieving, abominable, murderers, sexually immoral, sorcerers, idolaters, and all liars shall have their part in the lake which burns with fire and brimstone, which is the second death.”

1. Its Murder

2. Its Proudful

To say or think that you are better than someone else because you are a certain color, or certain intelligence or social economic status is the height of arrogance and pride. It is a sinful attitude that does not recognize that all comes from God. You are who you are because God determined it so. NOT you.

You have the parents you have because of God's decree

You have the color of your skin because of God's decree

You have the place you were born and raised because of God's decree

When you were unformed in the womb, God knew you.

1 Corinthians 4:7 (NKJV)

⁷For who makes you differ from another? And what do you have that you did not receive? Now if you did indeed receive it, why do you boast as if you had not received it?

1 Corinthians 15:10 (NKJV)

¹⁰But by the grace of God I am what I am, and His grace toward me was not in vain; but I labored more abundantly than they all, yet not I, but the grace of God which was with me.

For someone to say they had better parents, or a better place to live or better schools or a better color without recognizing that it is all by Gods Grace.

It is an abomination and is listed in Proverbs 6 as one of the 7 things God hates
PRIDE

1. Its Murder

2. Its Prideful

3. Its Prejudicial

James 2:1–4 (NKJV)

¹My brethren, do not hold the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Lord of glory, with partiality.

²For if there should come into your assembly a man with gold rings, in fine apparel, and there should also come in a poor man in filthy clothes,

³and you pay attention to the one wearing the fine clothes and say to him, “You sit here in a good place,” and say to the poor man, “You stand there,” or, “Sit here at my footstool,”

⁴have you not shown partiality among yourselves, and become judges with evil thoughts?

Jews prejudice of Gentiles

The initial separation was for religious purposes commanded by God to keep Israel pure. But the sinful heart took it further than God intended. It grew into a hatred of the Gentile, a settled animosity.

According to Rabbinic writings

non-Jews were presumed to be idolaters, and idolatry was associated with moral deviancy. Gentiles were disparaged not because they weren't Jewish, but because they were assumed to be morally deficient.

Perhaps the most troubling rabbinic statement about non-Jews was attributed to the 2nd-century sage Rabbi Shimon bar Yohai: “The best of the Gentiles should be killed.” This sentiment, never translated into law, was stated during the particularly cruel rule of Hadrian, and is associated with a relatively minor sage (Shimon bar Yohai later became considered more significant when the medieval kabbalist Moses de Leon attributed the authorship of a key mystical work, the *Zohar*, to him). Nonetheless, it is an extremely strong statement appearing in rabbinic literature.

Eliezer b. Hyrcanus is less tolerant. According to him, the mind of every non-Jew is always intent upon idolatry (Giṭ. 45b). The cattle of a heathen is unfit for sacrifices ('Ab. Zarah 23b). Explaining Prov. xiv. 34, he maintains that the non-Jews only practise charity in order to make for themselves a name (B. B. 10b; Pesiq. 12b; Gamaliel is credited with the same opinion in B. B. 10b). The persecutions which, at the instigation of Judæo-Christians, Eliezer had suffered at the hands of the Romans may explain his attitude, as well as his opinion that the Gentiles have no share in the life to come (Tosef., Sanh. xiii. 2; Sanh. 105a).

Eleazar of Modi'im, in reference to Micah iv. 5, explains that Israel, though guilty of the same sins as the Gentiles, will not enter hell, while the Gentiles will (Cant. R. ii. 1).

Eleazar ben Azariah maintains, on the basis of Ex. xxi. 1, that a judgment rendered by a non-Jewish (Roman) court is not valid for a Jew (Mek., Mishpaṭim)

“a strict Jew wouldn't even be the guest in a Gentile's house, nor would he have a guest in his house, since Gentiles were unclean. The scribal law said, “The dwelling places of Gentiles are unclean.”

And in fact, here's an interesting footnote just to kind of get a thought on this that is perhaps specific. It was considered that the dust or the dirt from a Gentile country was defiled, and if anybody happened to have some Gentile country dirt on their feet and tracked it into Israel, it remained defiled. It never mingled with Israel soil; it just stayed there continuously defiling the land. Consequently, whenever they left the Gentile country, they would always do what became a very famous phrase in the Bible, they would always shake off the dust off their feet so as not to track any Gentile pollution back into Israel”

In fact, milk that was drawn out of a cow by Gentile hands was not allowed to be consumed by Jews, so you had to make sure you checked on who provided your milk. Bread and oil, for example, prepared by a Gentile, could be sold to a stranger, but could never be used by a Jew. No Jew would eat with a Gentile at all. And in fact, if a Gentile was invited to a Jewish house, you couldn't leave him in the room lest he would defile all the food in the room. If cooking utensils, for example, were bought from a Gentile, they had to be purified by fire and water. Any article that was in the hands of a Gentile at any time was unclean. If you had, for example, a weaving shuttle and that weaving shuttle was made out of wood that was grown in a grove where Gentiles worshipped false god, you had to burn up the shuttle. Not only that, you had to find every piece of cloth ever produced on it and burn it too.”

| |
|--|
| The Salvation of the Gentiles, Part 1 |
|--|

| |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Sermons Acts 10:1-20 1734 Mar 25, 1973</i> |
|---|

Acts 10:9–21 (NKJV)

⁹The next day, as they went on their journey and drew near the city, Peter went up on the housetop to pray, about the sixth hour.

¹⁰Then he became very hungry and wanted to eat; but while they made ready, he fell into a trance

¹¹and saw heaven opened and an object like a great sheet bound at the four corners, descending to him and let down to the earth.

¹²In it were all kinds of four-footed animals of the earth, wild beasts, creeping things, and birds of the air.

¹³And a voice came to him, “Rise, Peter; kill and eat.”

¹⁴But Peter said, “Not so, Lord! For I have never eaten anything common or unclean.”

¹⁵And a voice spoke to him again the second time, “What God has cleansed you must not call common.”

¹⁶This was done three times. And the object was taken up into heaven again.

¹⁷Now while Peter wondered within himself what this vision which he had seen meant, behold, the men who had been sent from Cornelius had made inquiry for Simon’s house, and stood before the gate.

¹⁸And they called and asked whether Simon, whose surname was Peter, was lodging there.

¹⁹While Peter thought about the vision, the Spirit said to him, “Behold, three men are seeking you.

²⁰Arise therefore, go down and go with them, doubting nothing; for I have sent them.”

²¹Then Peter went down to the men who had been sent to him from Cornelius, and said, “Yes, I am he whom you seek. For what reason have you come?”

Acts 10:34–35 (NKJV)

³⁴Then Peter opened his mouth and said: “In truth I perceive that God shows no partiality.

³⁵But in every nation whoever fears Him and works righteousness is accepted by Him.

Acts 10:44–45 (NKJV)

⁴⁴While Peter was still speaking these words, the Holy Spirit fell upon all those who heard the word.

⁴⁵And those of the circumcision who believed were astonished, as many as came with Peter, because the gift of the Holy Spirit had been poured out on the Gentiles also.

Acts 15:6–9 (NKJV)

⁶ Now the apostles and elders came together to consider this matter. ⁷ And when there had been much dispute, Peter rose up and said to them: “Men and brethren, you know that a good while ago God chose among us, that by my mouth the Gentiles should hear the word of the gospel and believe. ⁸ So God, who knows the heart, acknowledged

them by giving them the Holy Spirit, just as *He did* to us, ⁹ and made no distinction between us and them, purifying their hearts by faith.

1. Its Murder
2. Its Prideful
3. Its Prejudicial

4. Its Blasphemy

Colossians 1:16–17 (NKJV)

¹⁶For by Him all things were created that are in heaven and that are on earth, visible and invisible, whether thrones or dominions or principalities or powers. All things were created through Him and for Him.

¹⁷And He is before all things, and in Him all things consist.

Acts 17:24–26 (NKJV)

²⁴God, who made the world and everything in it, since He is Lord of heaven and earth, does not dwell in temples made with hands.

²⁵Nor is He worshiped with men's hands, as though He needed anything, since He gives to all life, breath, and all things.

²⁶And He has made from one blood every nation of men to dwell on all the face of the earth, and has determined their preappointed times and the boundaries of their dwellings,

Genesis 11:7–9 (NKJV)

⁷Come, let Us go down and there confuse their language, that they may not understand one another's speech."

⁸So the Lord scattered them abroad from there over the face of all the earth, and they ceased building the city.

⁹Therefore its name is called Babel, because there the Lord confused the language of all the earth; and from there the Lord scattered them abroad over the face of all the earth.

Acts 15:18 (NKJV)

¹⁸"Known to God from eternity are all His works.

Colossians 3:8–11 (NKJV)

⁸But now you yourselves are to put off all these: anger, wrath, malice, blasphemy, filthy language out of your mouth.

⁹Do not lie to one another, since you have put off the old man with his deeds,
¹⁰and have put on the new man who is renewed in knowledge according to the image of Him who created him,
¹¹where there is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcised nor uncircumcised, barbarian, Scythian, slave nor free, but Christ is all and in all.

Revelation 7:9 (NKJV)

⁹ After these things I looked, and behold, a great multitude which no one could number, of all nations, tribes, peoples, and tongues, standing before the throne and before the Lamb, clothed with white robes, with palm branches in their hands,

To have hatred in your heart for any man, woman or child because they are a different color is to commit blasphemy. You are in effect saying that God does not know what He is doing.

You could have done it a better way.

That the way he has created and who he has created is bad.

So a better and Biblical Definition of Racism would be

A Blasphemous, God Dishonoring hatred
of other ethnic groups from Proud, Prideful, Prejudicial, Evil,
Hateful Angry people.

The Summation fo the sin of Racism

Proverbs 6:16–19 (NKJV)

¹⁶These six things the Lord hates, Yes, seven are an abomination to Him:

¹⁷A proud look, A lying tongue, Hands that shed innocent blood,

¹⁸A heart that devises wicked plans, Feet that are swift in running to evil,

¹⁹A false witness who speaks lies, And one who sows discord among brethren.

Racism produces:

Pride,

Deceit

Murder

Evil hearts

Evil plans

False accusations and false testimony

and Division

All of these can easily be applied to the ethnic hatred, we call racism.

Luke 18:9–14 (NKJV)

⁹ Also He spoke this parable to some who trusted in themselves that they were righteous, and despised others: ¹⁰ “Two men went up to the temple to pray, one a Pharisee and the other a tax collector. ¹¹ The Pharisee stood and prayed thus with himself, ‘God, I thank You that I am not like other men—extortioners, unjust, adulterers, or even as this tax collector. ¹² I fast twice a week; I give tithes of all that I possess.’ ¹³ And the tax collector, standing afar off, would not so much as raise *his* eyes to heaven, but beat his breast, saying, ‘God, be merciful to me a sinner!’ ¹⁴ I tell you, this man went down to his house justified *rather* than the other; for everyone who exalts himself will be humbled, and he who humbles himself will be exalted.”